5

10

15

20

25

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment represents a submission to accompany a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed herewith. This Amendment and associated RCE are submitted within the two month period following the Notice of Appeal filed on August 8, 2005. Please note that because October 8, 2005, fell on a Saturday, and because Monday, October 10, 2005, was a Federal holiday, the two month period following the Notice of Appeal extends to October 11, 2005. The current status of the claims is summarized below.

Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9, 13, 26, and 39 are currently amended.

Claims 21-24 and 34-37 are cancelled.

Claims 1-20, 25-33, and 38-40 are pending following entry of this Amendment.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jain et al. ("Jain" hereafter) (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,742). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With regard to amended claim 1, Jain does not teach marking data during data transfer as claimed. More specifically, Jain does not teach the following:

determining a fraction of an input buffer of the routing mechanism that is filled, generating a random number between zero and one, and

marking the data packet to indicate data transfer congestion if the generated random number is less than or equal to the fraction of the routing mechanism input buffer that is filled.

In contrast to the above-identified features of amended claim 1, Jain teaches a feedback algorithm to determine whether the rate at which packets are being received

AMENDMENT Page 12 ADAPP135/ASP/KDW

5

10

15

20

25

exceeds a knee capacity of the router. The knee capacity of the router refers to the load level at which demand on the router begins to approach the service rate of the router. As part of the feedback algorithm, Jain teaches determining a queue length, wherein the queue length is defined as the number of packets that are stored in the buffers waiting to be processed by the router (plus any packet that is being processed by the router). It should be appreciated that while the queue length of Jain is associated with a content of an input buffer of a routing mechanism, the queue length of Jain is not equivalent to the fraction of the input buffer of the routing mechanism that is filled. Rather, the queue length of Jain refers to the actual number of items stored in the input buffer of the router.

The feedback algorithm of Jain continues with calculating an average queue length and comparing the calculated average queue length to a preselected threshold length. If the average queue length exceeds the preselected threshold length, Jain teaches that a feedback selection function is invoked. The feedback selection function of Jain identifies specific source-destination (S-D) pairs whose packets transmission rates through the router should be reduced and sets the congestion avoidance flag <u>in all packets</u> associated with those S-D pairs.

The present invention as recited in claim 1 differs significantly from the feedback selection function of Jain. More specifically, claim 1 includes a feature of generating a random number between zero and one. Then, according to claim 1, the data packet is marked to indicate data transfer congestion if the generated random number is less than or equal to the fraction of the routing mechanism input buffer that is filled. Jain does not include any teaching regarding generation of a random number. Additionally, Jain does not include any teaching regarding marking of a data packet to indicate data transfer congestion based on comparison of the generated random number to the fraction of the routing mechanism input buffer that is filled.

AMENDMENT Page 13 ADAPP135/ASP/KDW

5

10

15

20

Furthermore, with regard to amended claim 1, Jain does not teach increasing the

data transfer rate in direction correlation to a lack of data transfer congestion as indicated

by unmarked data during a round trip time. More specifically, Jain does not teach

correlation of a data packet transmission rate adjustment to a data packet round trip time.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Jain does not teach each and every

feature of claim 1, as required to support an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over Jain. Also,

because each of dependent claims 2-12 incorporates each feature of amended claim 1,

each of claims 2-12 is patentable for at least the same reasons provided for amended

claim 1. Thus, the Office is requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-12.

With respect to claim 13, Jain does not teach a sending switch that includes code

for marking a packet to be sent by the sending switch with a congestion indicator if a

randomly generated value (between zero and one) is less than or equal to the capacity

level of the input buffer, wherein the capacity level of the input buffer corresponds to a

fraction of the input buffer that is filled. Additionally, Jain does not teach a sending

switch that includes code for leaving a packet to be sent by the sending switch unmarked

with respect to the congestion indicator if a randomly generated value (between zero and

one) is greater than the capacity level of the input buffer.

Based at least on the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Jain does not teach

each and every feature of claim 13, as required to support an anticipation rejection under

35 U.S.C. 102. Therefore, the Applicant submits that amended claim 13 is patentable

over Jain. Also, because each of dependent claims 14-20 and 25 incorporates each feature

of amended claim 13, each of claims 14-20 and 25 is patentable for at least the same

reasons provided for amended claim 13. Thus, the Office is requested to withdraw the

AMENDMENT Page 14 ADAPP135/ASP/KDW

rejections of claims 13-20 and 25. Also, the Office is requested to note that claims 21-24

have been cancelled.

5

10

15

20

25

Claims 26 and 39 have been amended to clarify that the capacity level is equal to a

fraction of the input buffer that is filled and that the probability factor is set as a multiple

of the capacity level. Also, amended claims 26 and 39 now recite generating a random

value between zero and one, and marking the data packet with a congestion indicator if

the randomly generated value is less than or equal to the probability factor, and otherwise

leaving the data packet unmarked.

Jain does not teach setting a probability factor as a multiple of a capacity level of

the input buffer, wherein the capacity level corresponds to a fraction of the input buffer

that is filled. Also, Jain does not teach marking the data packet with a congestion

indicator if a randomly generated value (between zero and one) is less than or equal to the

probability factor, and otherwise leaving the data packet unmarked.

For at least the above-identified reasons, Jain does not teach each and every

feature of each of claims 26 and 39 as required to support an anticipation rejection under

35 U.S.C. 102. Therefore, the Applicant submits that amended claims 26 and 29 are

patentable over Jain. Also, because each of dependent claims 27-33 and 38 incorporates

each feature of amended claim 26, each of claims 27-33 and 38 is patentable for at least

the same reasons provided for amended claim 26. Also, because dependent claim 40

incorporates each feature of amended claim 39, claim 40 is patentable for at least the

same reasons provided for amended claim 39. Thus, the Office is requested to withdraw

the rejections of claims 26-33 and 38-40. Also, the Office is requested to note that claims

34-37 have been cancelled.

The Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for

allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is requested. If the Examiner has any

AMENDMENT Page 15 ADAPP135/ASP/KDW

Application No.: 09/726,676

Amendment for RCE Dated: October 11, 2005 Reply to Final Office Action Dated: April 8, 2005

questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6914. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP135). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

10

5

Kenneth D. Wright Reg. No. 53,795

15

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200 Sunnyvale, California 94086

Tel: (408) 749-6900

Customer Number 25,920